071AAMTBC

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK -----x 2 3 IN RE: MTBE, 00 CV 1898 (SAS) 4 5 New York, N.Y. 6 July 1, 2010 5:30 p.m. 7 Before: 8 HON. SHIRA A. SCHEINDLIN, 9 District Judge 10 **APPEARANCES** 11 LEONARD KAUFMAN 12 Attorney for Plaintiff 13 MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY, LLP Attorneys for DEFENDANT BY: MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY, LLP 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

(Case called)

THE COURT: The court reporter has just joined us. I am going to summarize for the record what has happened so far in this conference.

I reviewed the plaintiff's letter of June 28th, 2010, lodging on objection to Special Master Warner's ruling, the defense letter in opposition dated June 7th and the plaintiff's reply letter dated July 1st.

Based on all that I've read I am concerned about removing state records against the policy of the state which is to maintain original records on site. I respect the notion that chain of custody is always going to be an issue. I think that Special Master Warner tried very hard to take care of that by suggesting that a special security guard or employee of the DEP followed the documents so that person could testify that they were always in DEP custody. But now I understand more fully how difficult that would be because the scanning of the documents has been scheduled on a 24 hour, seven day basis and there's nobody from the department who could do that. No employee could do that. The department's closest office would be Trenton and they just don't have the manpower or budget to put somebody in Manhattan on that schedule.

So having thought that over, I said earlier in this conference that, well, then the vendor should go to the state and whatever it takes the state will have to accommodate the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

vendor 24 hours, seven days a week. If that means they have to keep their security personnel at that location around the clock and Saturday and Sunday, so be it, until the scanning is done.

I was informed by the parties that the rate of scanning is three times faster off-site than on-site. To keep the pace going I also said that the vendor will have to bring in as many scanners as it takes to close that gap. So if they were doing 15 boxes a day with the current scan then we need to move that up to 50 boxes a day. Then they'll just have to bring in that many more personnel into the state's location and that may mean more scanning machines even though I understand these are more portable machines are smaller. They're not as efficient as the bigger machines. It is not unfortunate and I know it is going to be expensive but it really is the only way to keep the pace going and the pace has to be kept because we need to move this litigation along. It's, certainly, the plaintiff's benefit and the defendant's benefit too. scanning is being done so that there can be site selection by the appropriate dates, both discovery sites and trial sites.

So all of that said, before the court reporter arrived Mr. Kaufmann, counsel for plaintiff, said he would just tell his client it has to be done even though the client will not be happy. You'd have to keep the security personnel in place 24/7 and the defendants are not happy to have to have their vendor bring in all this additional machinery, but while nobody is

particularly happy with this ruling, I think it preserves everybody's rights. It does preserve the plaintiff's need to keep the documents on-site about which the state feels very strongly. But it also keeps the defendants capable of getting a huge mass of documents scanned in a quick fashion.

So, that's my Solomonic ruling here. I think that's where we were up to pretty much.

Oh, I know, just when the court report came

Mr. Kaufmann accused the defendants of having been tardy in

their requests but then Mr. Riccardulli for the defense

informed me that that issue was already raised before Special

Master Warner and that his ruling was that there was no

tardiness. So, I'm not going to revisit that. I don't think

it's part of the appeal. I think the appeal was really only

the problem ordering that the original documents be taken

off-site and so I've modified his order to the extent of

requiring that it be done on-site but be done 24/7 at the

defendant's expense.

Okay. Now all of that is on the record. Is there anything else either of you need to add?

MR. RICCARDULLI: We right before the court reporter we also discussed the issue against plaintiff's privilege review.

THE COURT: We did. But Mr. Kaufmann said he was, I thought, 99.9 percent finished with the review and -- maybe he

didn't say that. Maybe he said you were 99.5 percent on the way to agreeing on a claw back agreement.

MR. KAUFMANN: Yes, your Honor. And in terms of a privilege review it is my understanding of that review as not part of the progress of the production of documents and if we have to get boxes there, we will get the boxes there for the next conference.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. RICCARDULLI: That's the point I was actually going to make was that the speed of the review, we have had a review team in place and today we had four lawyers in addition to the scan team that's on-site and the report I received just a short while ago was that our review team sat for five hours today idle without any boxes to review. So this front end privilege review is slowing down the production. So our review time literally sat there for five hours while we've got them on-site.

THE COURT: That's not a good thing, Mr. Kaufmann.

That means that four or five lawyers were billing "X" amount of hours to do nothing. That is an unfair expense.

MR. KAUFMANN: All can I say, your Honor, is that that information is news to me. I get reports everyday and none of my reports that I get indicate that defendants had nothing to do.

THE COURT: That is today's report.

1	MR. KAUFMANN: Okay. I will check that out and
2	THE COURT: So, I suggest, Mr. Riccardulli, you keep
3	the lawyers from going in needlessly until they are at least
4	enough ahead of you to make sure timely so if they don't get
5	to work until July 4th, so be it.
6	MR. RICCARDULLI: Understand stood, your Honor.
7	THE COURT: Let them start catching up again on July
8	5th.
9	MR. RICCARDULLI: Understood. We will
10	THE COURT: You'll have to work with Mr. Kaufmann.
11	MR. KAUFMANN: In fact, Steve, you and I should
12	probably talk when the judge is finished with us.
13	THE COURT: Correct. I am finished. And if you need
14	to order this record and I think you might, Mr. Kaufmann, to
15	show your client that's now available. It will be available.
16	It is very short. Okay.
17	MR. KAUFMANN: Okay.
18	THE COURT: I'm going on to the next telephone
19	conference. Have a good weekend.
20	(Adjourned)
21	
22	
23	
24	
2.5	